DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 405 649 EA 028 287

AUTHOR Goldman, Paul; Conley, David T.
TITLE Persistence, Disillusionment, and Compliance in Educator Reactions to State School Reform.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compliance (Psychology); *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Institutions; Longitudinal Studies; Organizational Climate; Outcome Based Education; Performance Based Assessment; *Resistance to Change; School Culture; *School Restructuring; Schools; Social Psychology; *State Legislation
IDENTIFIERS *Oregon

ABSTRACT

Educator reticence in some states has exerted a moderating effect on attempts to redesign public schooling. This paper presents findings of a longitudinal study that investigated the phenomenon of educator reaction to systemic state school-reform legislation. Oregon's landmark school-reform legislation, passed in 1991 and revised in 1995, serves as a test case. Data were obtained from a self-administered survey of educators from a total of 92 schools during the years 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995. The findings indicate that Oregon educators continue to have a relatively positive attitude toward school reform, but support appears to have declined in 1995-96. Educators became much less optimistic that the reforms would improve student outcomes. Individual and school demography did not predict educator responses. In addition, for the first time there was a gender gap: men's expectations for school reform declined while those of women remained constant. The most interesting finding was the very large differences between school districts and individual schools, both within and across school districts, in each of the four years. The paper offers a working hypothesis based on social-compliance theory: Social compliance, as operationalized in the form of normative behavior, is important to explain the differences in school-level responses to educational reform legislation. Two tables are included. Appendices contain the questionnaire scale items; a proposed instrument for further research; educator's comments; and statistical tables showing the reactions to school reform at the individual, school district, and building levels. (Contains 39 references.) (LMI)

Persistence, Disillusionment, and Compliance in Educator Reactions to State School Reform

Paul Goldman & David T. Conley

College of Education

University of Oregon

Eugene, Oregon 97403

541-346-5065

541-346-5799

goldman@oregon.uoregon.edu

david_conley@ccmail.uoregon.edu

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, March 25, 1997.

Persistence, Disillusionment, and Compliance in Educator Reactions to State School Reform

Introduction

We investigate in this paper the phenomenon of educator reaction to state systemic school reform legislation. The difficulty of sustaining such state-level initiatives can be ascribed to a range of factors. Important among them is the seeming ambivalence shown by educators toward the dictates of legislators and departments of education. Educator reticence in some states has exerted a moderating effect, at the least, on attempts to redesign or refocus public schooling, although such reticence has never reached the levels of overt resistance witnessed among teachers in England and Wales (Black, 1994).

Oregon's landmark school reform legislation, passed in 1991 and revised in 1995, serves as a test case to consider educator reactions and to explore the limits of legislative power to reshape schooling and to consider educator reactions to state mandates in the context of social compliance. Through an annual survey and accompanying comments added by respondents, we have been able to track teacher perceptions of the reforms over a four-year period. The results allow us to explore the persistence or decay in attitudes toward mandated reforms. Furthermore, they provide a forum for considering the role of legislatures and state departments of education in education reform and restructuring. We utilize the analysis to raise questions about teacher compliance to state dictates.

Legislative attempts to mandate reform

In some states, legislatures and education agencies have had some initial success mandating fundamental restructuring of school governance, curriculum, and accountability (Steffy, 1993). This success can be explained, at least in part, by the truly massive increase in resources provided to schools in that state. Even so, conventional wisdom and a substantial body of academic research indicates how difficult it is for state policy to reach school sites and influence classroom practice (Fuhrman, 1993; Wilson and Rossman, 1993; Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; McLaughlin, 1990), particularly absent large amounts of new money for schools. Political and practical problems have caused several states to curtail or limit ambitious school reform plans (Case, 1994; Rothman, 1992)

Policy makers rarely build large-scale reforms based on the perceptions of teachers or principals. In fact, such a phenomenon would be hard to envisage, since teachers and principals (collectively) tend to express desired change in terms of incremental adaptation or intensification of their own current practices. Class size reduction is at the top of every list, followed by more parental responsibility for students and other ideas that tend to place responsibility outside the classroom. Although the leadership of educational groups may be consulted and individual educators may testify on a bill, the reform program is generally shaped by legislators' desires to address broader, perhaps more lofty, goals, and to respond to various political constituencies that have an interest in schools. This has been particularly true of reforms generated in the 1980s and 1990s, a period of time when much of the impetus for school reform has come from the business community's desires to see the quality of education improve. Less visible have been groups that were important initiators of reform programs over the past seventy years: most prominently higher education, groups seeking greater equity, and teachers' unions.

Although legislators and policy implementors often acknowledge rhetorically that school reform depends on teachers' ability (and willingness) to translate state mandates into practice, rarely has this rhetoric been coupled with a systematic understanding of what it would take for a program of reforms to move from statehouse to schoolhouse. Teachers are both distant from and skeptical of state politicians, educational policy makers, and, often, state department of education functionaries. This distance, physical and psychological, creates for them a certain "zone of discretion" within which they can operate. Teacher reactions are potentially shaped by a range of variables operating at the individual and group (school) level. Examination over time of individual teacher attitudes toward specific reform legislation may shed light on the dynamics of how such programs are processed and translated (or not translated) into practice.

What are the limits of legislative power?

Is it even possible for state legislation to initiate systemic school reform that works its way into curriculum, instruction, and assessment at the classroom and building level? Interestingly, no clear answer has emerged, although states continue major educational reform legislation under an implicit assumption that the result will be dramatic changes in classrooms and the public school system

generally. How can the translation phenomenon best be understood? The most logical starting place is the school building.

Many researchers have established the school building as the most viable unit of analysis for educational change (Fullan, 1991; Louis and Miles 1990; Teddlie and Stringfield 1993; Fullan and Miles 1992; Murphy and Hallinger 1993; Stockard and Mayberry 1992). But schools are somewhat odd creatures. One might assume the state had a quite legitimate right to tell schools what to do and how to do it since schools are not independent governmental agencies with control over their policies. Instead, they are "captive" institutions, controlled by school boards which are, in turn, creations of the state legislature.

If schools are technically "creatures of the legislature," why do they appear at times not to act in ways that reflect this formal linkage, and why do they seemingly not acknowledge the great power legislatures or state educational agencies hold over them in areas such as funding? A number of factors come to mind, including the local autonomy schools have had in most states, particularly western states. Weick's (1976) notions of "loosely-coupled systems" obviously apply, but do not fully explain school independence. What other factors are at work to create independent, autonomous school districts and buildings?

One of the most important is the strong tradition of funding schools from locally-derived property taxes. As a result of this system, local patrons expect to exercise control over how "their" money is spent on education. However, the face of school finance has been altered over the past 25 years, during which time more than 35 states have centralized funding at the state level in an attempt to foster equity (Odden and Wohlstetter 1992). This change in the locus of control over funding, in combination with other forces, has emboldened state legislatures to launch initiatives that would not have passed during the era of more decentralized school funding.

This history of decentralized, "loosely-coupled" management of a state-controlled governmental unit has nurtured, if inadvertently, the creation of strong cultures within school districts, and, more importantly, school buildings. One result of these distinct cultures is that schools do not process external mandates in a predictable fashion. Each culture becomes adept at filtering the external system's demands and, over time, develops layers of coping mechanisms that confound all reforms that are not consistent with the values of the culture or

that cannot be shaped to the utilitarian needs of the school. But what happens when these traditions of local autonomy clash with policies from legislatures that begin to exercise authority more directly?

Structure and goals of this paper

We use this paper to explore two topics that help shed some light on the phenomenon of how educators process state-level policy initiatives. First, we present Oregon educator reactions to school reform legislation in the four years after it was passed in 1991 and modified in 1995. We surveyed and interviewed teachers and administrators yearly from 1992 through 1995, charting their reactions and analyzing their responses. Although we gave survey instruments to individuals, our basic sampling unit was the school, allowing us to track collective changes over time on a school-by-school basis. In this paper, we summarize the results of these surveys.

We emphasize the broad policy issues noted in the previous paragraph as a means to connect our findings with an emerging body of research on the role of policy in school change. We also explore the meaning of our findings in light of a disciplinary approach in organizational science, social compliance, rooted in social psychology. This focus allows us to understand the more universal processes that may be operating here, and, more importantly from our perspective, to help us grapple with a critical unresolved issue: can we identify those factors or combinations of factors that help explain why some schools embrace and implement reform while others struggle unsuccessfully to change, and still other resist all efforts to change them.

The paper progresses as follows. First, we provide a brief overview of Oregon's reform legislation as it has developed between 1991 and 1996. Second, we describe our research methodology, data collection, and data strategies. Third, we present and discuss general findings, especially trends that have emerged from our data over the past five years. And fourth, we use the concept of social compliance to develop useful hypotheses about school restructuring at the building level.

The Oregon context

In 1991 the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 3565, the *Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century*, laying out a new vision of schooling for the

state's 1,200 public elementary and secondary schools. The Act presents a complex framework for systemic redesign of education, preschool through post-secondary. Influenced by *America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages* and other calls for reform, its intention was to create a "restructured educational system...to achieve the state's goals of the best educated citizens in the nation by the year 2000 and a work force equal to any in the world by the year 2010." Specifically, the 1991 Act contained provisions regarding students readiness to learn by kindergarten entry, non-graded developmental education that included multi-age primary classrooms, the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) at age 16, the Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM) to replace a high school diploma and link with community college studies and the world of work, integration of social services with schools, alternative learning centers for youths not succeeding in secondary school, and site-based decision making. These provisions were to be fully phased in by 1999.

With no additional changes by the 1993 Legislature, the Act remained a fixed, if fuzzy, target for educators and the state education agency between 1991 and 1995. A State Superintendent of Instruction who was a career politician rather than an educator was a vigorous proponent of the reform effort and pushed her staff to form task forces and travel the state to explain and "sell" the legislation to administrators, teachers, and parents. However, it proved to be more difficult to sketch in the details that to construct the vision. Efforts to translate the Act's broad goals into clear frameworks and procedures for schools to follow fell short, and initial attempts to create pilot projects at schools met with opposition, ended in confusion, or were not built upon systematically.

But in 1995 the Legislature reacted to concerns of parents and others, especially those opposed to "outcomes-based" education. The biennial session re-examined the legislation and made several significant changes in the form of H.B. 2991. Most notably, the CIM and CAM were sharpened to focus on "rigorous academic content standards," the timeline for implementing the CIM was moved back to the 1998-99 school year, the CAM was postponed until two years after the Board of Education adopts final standards and regulations for it, the Department of Education was required to report to the Legislature on plans and progress for the CIM and CAM, and grades and the high school diploma were maintained. Guidelines for school site councils were changed as well: rather than mandating a teacher majority on the committee, H.B. 2991 prohibited teacher majorities.

Educators have had a six-year period in which to contemplate these looming changes, not knowing for sure what their ultimate shape would be, or even whether they would be sustained. Our surveys and interviews captured educator reactions to this dynamic, fluid situation during this period of time.

Research Methods

Research data come from a series of self-administered questionnaires distributed and returned during Fall 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995. A total of 92 schools were included in the 1992 sample, 64 from a state random sample and 28 from two mid-sized "case study districts" in which we surveyed every school in the district. The 1993 sample of 24 schools (25 actually since one original school was divided after a new facility was opened) was drawn from among schools surveyed the previous year. For the 1994 sample, all schools in the 1993 sub-sample were re-surveyed, 24 more schools were randomly selected from the remaining schools in the original sample and an additional 24 schools, not previously surveyed, were selected by a random process and added to the sample. Analysis of demographic data and response patterns indicated that the newly added schools were similar to those in the original sample. The 1995 sample contained the same school sample as 1994. However, a smaller proportion of schools returned surveys than in previous years. In each school, questionnaires were distributed to all certified staff. Table 1 summarizes sample parameters and return rates. More detailed descriptions of procedures are provided in Goldman and Conley (1994) and Conley and Goldman (1995).

Table 1. Sample characteristics

	1992	1993	1994	1995
Number of schools	92	25	67	62
School return rate (%)	99	100	94	86
Number of returned surveys	2,260	602	1,247	1,093
Individual return rate (%)	66	65	67	59

The survey instrument contained 99 "agree-disagree" questions in 1992 and 1993. The number of questions was cut to 50 for 1994 and 1995. As data analysis evolved over the four year period, we were able to create three distinct additive scales measuring general attitudes towards change (we call this "change" in the

text), expectation that educational practices would change as a result of the legislation ("practices"), and anticipated outcomes of the statewide reform effort ("outcomes"). Specific questionnaire items for each scale are listed in Appendix A. We standardized scales so that individual scores, school means, and sample means reflect the average percentage of respondents who "agreed" with each set of statements.

In addition to forced-choice items, there were demographic questions, open ended questions, and a "comments" section. Over half the respondents added hand-written comments of some kind. We analyzed the comments data using categories that parallel the topical areas covered in the survey instrument and cross-referenced the comments with the school's score on the "change" scale to draw some inferences regarding the intensity of support or opposition to reform within school buildings.

First Order Findings: Or What We "Know" So Far

Several substantively and statistically significant findings have emerged from the data. First, Oregon educators continue to have a relatively positive attitude toward school reform, but support seems to have declined in 1995-96. There is less sense of urgency and less belief that the present system is seriously flawed. Second, after some initial skepticism and raised expectations that changes would be substantial during the second and third years, the trend turned downward this past year. Third, educators became much less optimistic that the reforms would improve student outcomes. Fourth, as we noted in reports of previous surveys, individual and school demography--elementary or secondary, rich or poor, large or small, do not predict educator responses. But, fifth, for the first time, there is a "gender gap:" men's attitudes towards school reform and hopes/expectations for the Oregon reforms declined while women remained constant.

How do we interpret these findings? First, and certainly most important, the gap between policy making at the state capital and policy implementation at the building level remains high, even in a small, comparatively homogeneous state. School building factors, especially leadership and school culture, mediate attitudes and behavior towards school restructuring (Conley & Goldman, 1995). Pogrow (1996) suggests that large-scale reform will always require highly specific, systematic, and structural methodologies of high quality matched to the content

of the initiative. He argues that school-wide change has never worked and that the most important changes are incremental. Large-scale systems change often contradicts forces operating at school sites. Fullan (1996) emphasizes teacher meaning making and networking as keys to reform implementation. In short, thinking about the interaction between and among teachers, schools as social systems, and the external education policy structure has become more complex and multidimensional.

Second, these data suggest the limits of state policy absent very specific follow-through and reaffirmation, and perhaps in more absolute terms as well. Written comments on surveys indicate that symbolic factors are often significant. The rhetorical attacks on "H.B. 3565," and the Governor's decision to accommodate changes in the law, allowed those who wished to view the 1995 legislative changes as a retreat from implementing reform to have their preconceptions confirmed, what Sarason (1990) alluded to when he forecast "the predictable failure of educational reform." Hawthorne effects may also have played a role: many teachers' initially positive reactions turned equivocal as they discovered the breadth and depth of the legislation and the additional demands it put on their time and energy. However, findings also indicate the surprising resilience of some schools in the face of multiple jolts (funding cuts, school district consolidations, school reform requirements). This resilience runs counter to generalizations that schools will simply reject reforms that require them to do things differently.

From the outset, educators believed the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century was largely well-intentioned and that it was directed to the big issues of fundamental school restructuring and to improving student academic performance. A majority believed school reform was necessary and were at least cautiously positive towards the basic thrust of the reform legislation Educators have become slightly less positive over time, with the largest drop occurring in the past year. Educators believed (and still believe) that implementation of the reform legislation would change teaching practices, for example teachers would use more integrated curriculum, change ways they group students, and employ a wider range of instructional strategies. They believed the reforms, fully implemented, would improve educational outcomes for most students. While a majority still think so, this optimistic view has attenuated over the past four years. Again the drop was more pronounced in the most recent survey.

A review of several of the items that evince the greatest change over the four years of surveys provides some insight into the changing perceptions of educators. Table 2 summarizes these items. While they were losing faith in the ability of the certificates of mastery to improve student learning, they were simultaneously indicating they were already doing much of what HB 3565 requires, and they were less likely to agree that they would need to change their teaching a great deal to comply with the law. They were also less likely to agree that it was time for fundamental change in education. In essence, it appears that educators were backing off their initial perceptions that the law was, in fact, fundamental restructuring, and were viewing it much more in terms of incremental adaptation of existing practice. A number of schools began initiating their own responses to the law, even before the state department of education had formulated rules and regulations.

Table 2: Items with largest changes

Year:	1992	1993	1994	1995	% change
Many schools are already doing much of what H.B. 3565/2991 mandates	30	35	43	44	+14
Will not be implemented because it is unrealistic	34	34	36	43	+11
Am skeptical	52	52	63	64	+12
Intent is job training	56	54	52	46	-10
Site councils will improve learning	69	67	65	58	-11
Will lead to new and diverse ways to organize or group students for learning	77	76	76	66	-11
Current system isn't working for many kids	59	55	50	46	-13
Educational philosophy of developmentally appropriate practices in grades 1-3 will improve learning	80	74	76	66	-14
Certificate of Initial Mastery will improve learning	66	63	55	51	-15
Mixed age classrooms in grades 1-3 will improve learning	59	57	54	43	-16
Intent is to move to learner outcomes as the way to judge schools	72	69	60	56	-16
Certificate of Advanced Mastery will improve learning	65	64	56	48	-17
Will cause more children to enter kindergarten better prepared to learn	45	38	28	25	-20
If 3565/2991 is implemented, how much would you have to change? (% "a great deal":)	29	27	19	9	-20
It is time for fundamental change in education	56	55	42	36	-20
Certificate of Initial Mastery will lead to decrease in dropouts	45	45	26	24	-21

This phenomenon of "spontaneous adaptation" is interesting, since if schools are running ahead of the state executive agency charged with defining reforms, what effect does this have within a system where institutional isomorphism is strong? Other schools, as well as the state education agency, will tend to look to the "early movers" to operationalize the reform program. These schools, however change-oriented they may be, will tend to adapt existing practice incrementally within their cultural and value systems. The net effect is a blunting

and accommodating of the reforms to the existing structure of the system. This works perfectly well with rules and regulations that are oriented toward small refinements of existing practice; its utility in the context of systemic reform initiatives is perhaps more problematic.

Respondents also indicated less agreement with various proposed goals for the law. This suggests that the focus of reform had become less clear to educators. Rather than viewing the purposes as job training, improved readiness or preparation of students, or more diverse teaching techniques, educators seemed to be less clear on the law's goals. A law written to be "visionary" and to serve as a "wake-up call to educators," as its key sponsor in the legislature described it, lost its capacity to incite teachers, in particular, to consider significant changes in practice. And if the broad and challenging goals can be disavowed, the implications for practice can similarly be blunted. This allows schools (and teachers) to label or repackage current practice in ways that permit them to believe they are already doing much of what the law requires. The law is then translated into a series of procedural responses; which tests to give, which remedial courses to offer, how to report the results to parents, how to adapt scoring guides to traditional assignments, etc. Basic practices and assumptions are not questioned or changed significantly. The data support this interpretation: the proportion who believed schools were already doing what the law mandated increased 14 percent even though the requirements for implementation were not clearly defined, while those who believed it was time for fundamental change in education decreased by 20 percent.

Survey responses indicate that many individual demographic factors such as age and experience, and school/district demographic factors such as average student SES and number of students had little or no effect on attitudes. Schools furthest from Salem, the state capital, were least enthusiastic about the legislation. The first survey (1992), showed little difference between men and women and elementary and secondary teachers. However, in each year, larger and larger differences appeared: elementary teachers and women stayed the same, but secondary educators and men were less positive, less optimistic. Appendix B shows how the these demographic factors have correlated with teacher attitudes over the four year period.

District and school-level differences

The most interesting finding was the very large differences between school districts and individual schools, both within and across school districts, in each of the four years. Appendices C and D provide a summary overview of these data. School or district demography did not explain these differences, and we have been particularly interested in understanding why teachers in some schools have been so much more responsive to the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century than others. There is no "obvious" pattern to those schools that have supported reform and those that have not. Some schools have remained constant in their attitude, either supportive or unsupportive, while others have changed dramatically in one direction or the other.

Why is this occurring? The obvious answer is unsatisfying, that schools are complex organizations where a multitude of variables affect the way in which any external (or internal) force is processed. Which theories potentially explain and predict this variance? Psychological theories offers some possible explanation, but require an insight into each individual that is beyond the scope of our ability to process and comprehend. Furthermore, it may not be necessary to understand the total psychological makeup of the individual, but instead, how she or he operates in a specific social context. At the same time, many sociological models may generalize too far beyond the idiosyncratic human interaction that must be accommodated if the behavior of schools as institutions is to be understood. If this is the case, social psychology may offer a better starting point. We selected the concept of social compliance as the starting point for our investigation of the phenomenon of schools' varied reaction to state educational reform legislation. Although it does not have the richness or empirical underpinnings of full-blown theory, it seems a useful lens and worthy of further development as a tool to understand individual behavior in organizational contexts where external mandates are being processed.

Using the Concept of Social Compliance to Understand Educator Reactions

The concept of compliance provides one possible way to explore differences in school engagement in statewide educational restructuring. We can view reform legislation as a change by the Legislature in the behaviors deemed acceptable for teachers. Since the Legislature is the theoretical source of legitimacy,

its actions would be expected to generate compliant behaviors, or at least establish the normative expectations or range.

The notion of social compliance has its own problems as a framework. Social psychologists have thought of compliance as something an individual does in response to coercion of some sort. We are conceptualizing compliance more in the way that physicists describe gravity, as an invisible force that allows for action at a distance and interaction among seemingly unrelated objects, that unites a system. We think of compliance as a force that, at one extreme, binds together the actions of individuals in a social system such as a school in an invisible, almost imperceptible way, and, that at the other, triggers direct cause-and-effect behaviors to receive rewards or avoid punishments. Barnard noted in 1938 that "...the common sense of community informally arrived at affects the attitude of individuals, and makes them, as individuals, loath to question authority. . ." We posit that on the low end of this continuum, but just above what Barnard labels the "zone of indifference," compliance operates on an almost subliminal level to reinforce educators' collective responses to external mandates. In essence, the social bonds that are present in any stable group have varying degrees of effect on each individual within the organization. External mandates create turbulence but do not necessarily disrupt these bonds

Gary Yukl (1991), an organizational psychologist, describes compliance in a fashion that seems to capture the behaviors many educators' demonstrate in response to reform legislation:

> Compliance means that the target is willing to do what the agent asks but is apathetic rather than enthusiastic about it and will make only a minimal effort. The agent has influenced the target person's behavior but not the person's attitudes. The target person is not convinced that the decision or action is the best thing to do, or even that it will be effective for accomplishing its purpose (p. 13).

Yukl contrasts compliance with resistance. Resistance signifies active opposition, rather than indifference, to a proposal or request, and implies active efforts to avoid or block mandate. Specific examples of resistant behavior include (1) making excuses why it can't work, (2) trying to get the request withdrawn, (3) delaying, hoping that whoever made the request will stop caring, (4) pretending to comply but actually sabotaging the task, (5) and refusing outright. All of these

are common educator responses to new policy initiatives, programs, or school restructuring mandates whether they initiate from the state, district, or building level.

But even compliance is often not enough: token engagement with educational reform doesn't provide the commitment and energy necessary for school restructuring. As Yukl points out, compliance is satisfactory for simple tasks, not for those that are complex. The problem of compliance is exacerbated in state-level school reform because the issuing authorities (usually legislators or the state education agency) are distant and rarely command personal affection or respect.

Aronson (1988) suggests that social psychology's approach to compliance treats it as being closely linked to both conformity and to social influence. In general, individuals will comply when they identify in some fashion with those who issue directives or requests. For example, they may personally like or respect their superiors, or they may share the same values or visions with them. In the literature on educational reform, this view is reflected by the attention given to the functions of leadership and the importance of a shared sense of goals or mission.

Values and beliefs are important components of motivation and performance at work. But they don't operate abstractly; perceived connections between cause-and-effect are also important. It may not be enough for educators to value school reform abstractly, or even to agree with policies and practices that result from legislative changes. They have to believe that their choices to invest time and energy--individually and collectively--will have payoffs in better outcomes for students and/or a better quality of working life for them and their colleagues. This relationship is the central feature of "valence-instrumentality-expectancy theory" about work motivation (Pinder, 1991), and also manifests itself in discussions of the importance of perceived teacher efficacy (Rosenholtz, 1989 for one).

Zones of indifference and discretion

In his 1938 classic, Barnard (1968) posited the notion of a "zone of indifference" to explain why individuals comply without questioning or thinking. He explained the "zone of indifference" in the following manner:

> If all the orders for actions reasonably practicable were to be arranged in the order of their acceptability to the person affected, it may be conceived that there are a number which are clearly unacceptable, that is, which certainly will not be obeyed; there is another group somewhat more or less on the neutral line, that is, either barely acceptable or barely unacceptable; and a third group unquestionably acceptable. This last group lies within the "zone of indifference." The person affected will accept orders lying within this zone and is relatively indifferent as to what the order is so far as the question of authority is concerned. Such an order lies within the range that in a general way was anticipated at the time of undertaking the connection with the organization. . .
>
> The zone of indifference will be wider or narrower depending on the degree to which the inducements exceed the burdens and sacrifices which determine the individual's adhesion to the organization. . .
>
> Since the efficiency of organization is affected by the degree to which individuals assent to orders, denying the authority of an organization communication is a threat to the interests of all individuals who derive a net advantage from their connection with the organization, unless the orders are unacceptable to them also. Accordingly, at any given time there is among most of the contributors an active personal interest in the maintenance of the authority of all orders which to them are in the zone of indifference. The maintenance of this interest is largely a function of informal organization. Its expression goes under the names of "public opinion," "organization opinion," "feeling in the ranks," "group attitude," etc. Thus the common sense of community informally arrived at affects the attitude of individuals, and makes them, as individuals, loath to question authority that is within or near the zone of indifference. (pp. 168-169)

This interpretation emphasizes the passive dimension of the individual's participation by focusing on the areas where assent is granted without decision or cognitive mediation. This "glass half-empty" perspective focuses on the worker as recipient of policy. Instead, we propose that the glass be viewed as half full. In essence, we see organizational members as much more active and influential in shaping and reshaping directives and their implementation. To accomplish this

formulation, we must consider adding at least one more zone to the continuum, a "zone of discretion."

This zone is between the indifference and acceptance zones and is a place where employees make relatively sophisticated decisions based upon a host of variables. They do so, both in terms of the effects of a policy upon themselves, and in light of Barnhard's observation that "denying the authority of an organization communication is a threat to the interests of all individuals who derive a net advantage from their connection with the organization." This is the zone of professional judgment, the translating of policy into practice in ways that preserve the initial goals of the policy but respect the desires for autonomy and what Lipsky calls the realities of work processing, the prioritizing of what gets done.

Organizational members walk a fine line within the zone of discretion, between exercising legitimate professional judgment and defying legitimate organizational directives. Educators, in particular, have come to exercise wider and wider zones of discretion as they have accumulated more authority over working conditions via collective bargaining agreements, as they have aged so that many faculties have a large plurality past mid-career, as due process guarantees and procedural safeguards have strengthened tenure, and as the number of quasi-administrative roles and opportunities open to teachers has expanded dramatically, enhancing their access to "executive-level" knowledge and discretion.

Four zones

It might be useful to think of reactions in four possible zones: rejection, discretion, indifference, and acceptance. In the zone of rejection, sanctions and clear procedures would be paramount. In the zone of discretion, the emphasis would be on increasing understanding and ownership of the policy, followed by rapid iterations, each with increasing detail and specificity, that moved from a conceptual to a practical framework for understanding and processing the policy in practice. In the zone of indifference, policy might be implemented with minimal resources and an emphasis on how to adapt existing procedures and practices to the policy. In the zone of acceptance, the emphasis would be on

rewards with less attention paid to cultivating the buy-in of those charged with implementing the policy, since it would be assumed.

The haziness of the boundaries of the "zone of discretion" in particular can be observed in cases where educators have chosen, sometimes with disastrous results, how much to comply with state policies, laws, and dictates in sensitive policy areas. A recent case of a local principal being dismissed by the school board for failure to report properly or investigate adequately allegations of sexual harassment or inappropriate conduct by several coaches illustrates this point. The principal in question exercised personal judgment about whether to follow the letter of the law and attempted, from his point of view, to serve the best interests of the school and the individuals involved. He did not, however, comply with the requirements of the law. His defense was that he was "doing what was best for all involved." This exercise of professional judgment ended up costing him his job. The effects in this instance were much clearer; there was a demonstrable cause-and-effect sequence.

Such is not the case in teacher compliance with reform mandates. Here teachers, in particular, seem to have adopted a much more passive stance, merely doing the minimum rather than taking ownership of the reforms and utilizing them as tools in ways consistent with the teachers' job responsibilities. They have remained firmly (and safely) within the zone of discretion.

Educators as street-level bureaucrats

Oregon educators were exhibiting in their responses to legislative mandate a level of autonomy consistent with the view of them as "street-level bureaucrats" commonly used to portray teachers, nurses, police officers, and social workers. Lipsky (1980) noted that

> Most analysts take for granted that the work of lower-level participants will more or less conform to what is expected of them. Organizational theorists recognize that there will always be some slippage between orders and the carrying out of orders, but this slippage is usually attributed to poor communication or workers' residual, and not terribly important, disagreement with organizational goals. In any event, such difficulties are

> usually considered unimportant enough that organizations can overcome them.
>
> This observation is partly derived from the recognition that lower level workers' behavior in organizations, including public agencies, appears to be cooperative. Workers for the most part accept the legitimacy of the formal structure of authority, and they are not in a position to dissent successfully.
>
> But what if workers do not share the objectives of their superiors? (1980, p. 16)

It appears likely that teachers, like some of these other semi-professions, have a relatively large "zone of discretion," within which they make decisions regarding which state directives they will and will not choose to acknowledge. The consistently large number of educators that each year indicated that they were going to "wait and see" whether the state was serious about school reform suggests that the legislature's action lacked certain elements necessary to generate compliance, and that educators felt quite comfortable and legitimate expressing doubts.

Lipsky focuses on the relationship between workers and their managers to describe and explain the motivations street-level bureaucrats have as they interpret agency policy. However, much of what he states in the following section may have broader implications if we think not just in terms of compliance with managerial directives, but in terms of how the street-level bureaucrat processes policy directives from afar, from state agencies and legislatures.

> In general, lower-level workers have different job priorities than managers. At the very least, workers have an interest in minimizing the danger and discomforts of the job and maximizing income and personal gratification. These priorities are of interest to management for the most part only as they relate to productivity and effectiveness. In street-level bureaucracies lower-level workers are likely to have considerably more than minimal differences with management. Earlier it was suggested that worker compliance is affected by the extent to which managers' orders are considered legitimate. Street-level bureaucrats may consider legitimate the right of managers to provide directives, but they may consider their managers' policy objectives illegitimate. Teachers asked to participate in compensatory education programs in which they do not believe, or

policemen no longer able to arrest derelicts for alcoholism, may resist these policy objectives in various ways. . .

Managers are interested in achieving results consistent with agency objectives. Street-level bureaucrats are interested in processing work consistent with their own preferences and only those agency policies so salient as to be backed up by significant sanctions. These sanctions must be limited. If everything receives priority, nothing does. . .

This is a neat paradox. Lower-level participants develop coping mechanisms contrary to an agency's policy but actually basic to its survival. . . Another aspect of street-level bureaucrats' role interests is their desire to maintain and expand their autonomy. Managers try to restrict workers' discretion in order to secure certain results, but street-level bureaucrats often regard such efforts as illegitimate and to some degree resist them successfully. Indeed, to the extent that street-level bureaucrats (and this would include police, teachers, social workers, and nurses, as well as doctors and lawyers) expect themselves to make critical discretionary decisions, many of managers' efforts to dictate service norms are regarded as illegitimate. To the extent that this is the case we have uncovered a condition for non-compliance for lower-level workers (pp. 18-19).

Teachers reactions to state legislation seem to fit the criteria suggested by Lipsky in several important respects. They perceive the reforms as an intrusion into their realm of discretionary decision-making and as an attempt to specify the work-processing procedures in schools. Teachers may be reflecting a heightened belief in professional empowerment, as evidenced by the fact that they believe they should be consulted regarding any proposed change that affects classroom practice, and that they reserve the right to withhold compliance until such time as it is clear to them exactly what they are being asked to do and that they will be given the support necessary to be successful. Furthermore, they tend to view any call for change in practice as being predicated on the allocation of additional new resources above and beyond what is already being expended on education. Change means adding new things, not eliminating old ones. The state must determine how the new and existing fit together, or tell teachers what they must abandon. Appendix F contains sample comments from respondents that illustrate these points.

How much compliance should be expected?

Educators in our surveys indicated that the initial ideas of the reform, performance-based certificates, site councils, more accountability, more preschool opportunities, linkages with social service agencies, were all likely to lead to an increase in student learning. In fact, the only aspect of reform they rejected initially was the lengthening of the school year, a component that was removed by the Legislature in 1995 primarily for fiscal reasons. So their reticence to make the changes necessary to support these goals was not based on a disavowal of the goals themselves. Regardless of whether they favor or oppose the changes, educators and policy-makers generally agree that the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century will result in profound changes for the state's schools if it is implemented in its entirety. They also know that the changes require educators to contribute significant time, energy, and commitment.

Bear in mind that the sanctions and rewards for compliance are not strong, at least at this point. One motivation educators gave for complying early was that they were already doing what the law will require. There was little sentiment expressed that the law should be implemented simply because it was a law, or that teachers should begin to change their practices because it was a law and they agreed it would enhance their effectiveness with students. Educators saw few rewards or punishments that would result from the changes they chose to make or not to make based on the law.

The dynamics here are interesting, since teachers could reasonably be expected to be more socially compliant than the general population. The education profession tends to drive out non-conformists, and the basic purpose of schooling is the transmission of established, endorsed cultural values, hardly an endeavor that can long tolerate individuals who disown the legitimate authority of the state. Teachers are in some senses role models for social compliance, and almost every school teaches students to be socially compliant, sometimes to the detriment of other aspects of their developing personalities. Students are frequently exhorted to do what they are told because it is "right" to do so, not simply because they will "get in trouble" if they don't. How do teachers rationalize their questioning, conditional acceptance, or rejection of a clear directive from their legitimate supervisor, the Legislature? Could it be that there are competing systems of compliance operating?

Questions awaiting answers

The following questions, which flow from our data, seem to follow more-or-less logically from the social compliance approach. Note that we are trying to pose possible differences in schools rather than in individuals even though we mention individuals at times. Given our research and the literature on teacher and school responses to statewide reform, we start with the assumption that most people (and schools) would just as soon not change much. However, some schools do change. We posed the following questions, based on our data, and reached some tentative conclusions:

1. Are individuals more likely to accept, initiate, and sustain restructuring activities if they personally support the reforms in theory? How important are attitudes and values? Are they the most important factor, or does the strength of the attitude and value have to cross some critical threshold before it becomes activated?

2. Are individuals and schools more likely to accept, initiate, and sustain restructuring activities if their colleagues support the reforms in theory? How important is social support? Is state policy implemented to a greater degree in schools that have mechanisms for processing information and external mandates than in schools that rely on following informal and formal leaders?

3. Is a school more likely to initiate and sustain restructuring activities if it has had *successful* experience in the past (and a consequent belief that there is a reasonable balance between costs and benefits)? How does success relate to the costs, such as burn-out of key participants? This hypothesis does not speak to *unsuccessful* previous experience.

4. Are schools most likely to initiate and sustain restructuring activities if teachers perceive the costs of *not* doing so to be high, for example loss of funding, status, or local support, or the reward of doing so are proportionate to the risk? Where are the "trigger mechanisms" on both ends of the spectrum?

5. What is the principal's relative power to enhance social compliance within a school through means other than formal authority? How does this power affect a school's response to externally-mandated reforms?

Our research is suggesting to us a set of interactive factors, including those contained in the questions above, that combine to affect the ways in which a school processes external reforms. Our working hypothesis is that social compliance, as operationalized in the form of normative behavior, is important to explain the differences in school-level responses to educational reform legislation.

The important variables that bear on social compliance within a school may include the following:

1. Inherent tendency toward compliance of each individual faculty member.
2. Strength of the bonds among faculty members (social cohesion).
3. Norms of the school as they affect communication and exchange of information (culture).
4. Formal and informal leadership structures, particularly the principal.
5. Strength of the enticements and sanctions applied by the state.
6. The school's history with previous reforms or programs of improvement.
7. Values of teachers and of the community in which the school is located.

Conclusion

There may be other important variables, as well. Those identified in the previous section may offer a jumping-off point for a systematic investigation of the relationship of the forces acting to process externally-mandated reform that intervene into the daily functioning of the school as social community, changes that cause teachers to examine or alter their practices in relationship to one another, not to educational change generically. We are well aware that others have pointed out the importance of these dimensions to the change process more generally (Fullan, 1991). Our goal is to develop instruments that capture and test the relative strength of these variables as moderators for external policy initiatives. Appendix E contains an example of an instrument that might be used to gather such data.

When Lipsky described the actions of street-level bureaucrats, he was referring to behavior strictly within the chain of command of an organizational unit. However, we seek to understand the relationship as the chain extends beyond the school building and school district to the state education agency and, ultimately, the legislature. Such an understanding is particularly important now, because many legislatures are beginning to examine alternatives to the public school system in the form of such innovations as charter schools or voucher programs. Often legislators support such programs because schools are (or seem from the legislator's perspective to be) intractable to change. If state legislatures cannot effect policy changes in individual school buildings with some reliability via legislatively-mandated reform programs, the alternatives seem clear: they will begin to work outside the existing system of schooling.

One inference that can be drawn is that educators do not see a direct or strong linkage between the funds provided by legislatures and the responsibility to implement legislative programs. Although the state provides approximately 70 percent of the funding for education, respondents indicated overwhelmingly they would implement reforms only when new or additional monies were provided. In fact, the state teachers' union had been successful in inserting a section in the law stating that no section of the law that required additional funding would be implementing without such funding. School budgets were being cut in many Oregon school districts during the 1990s, further strengthening the sense of educators that they had little obligation to follow a reform project that, in their minds, required new resources to be implemented successfully. Educators do not seem to perceive state base funding as being useful for implementing specific mandates, even if the mandates do not have explicitly identifiable fiscal impacts. The current level of funding is seen as a "given" to which additional revenue must be added for changes to occur.

Increases in resources, while often cited as the prerequisite to reform, may never be adequate to bring about changes in schools. For example, the 1993 Education Reform Act in Massachusetts sought to boost student learning and provided additional dollars to schools to achieve its goals. A recent report (Education Week, March 5, 1997) indicates that for many districts, the dollars went basically to cover increases in special education costs, and as a result "little of the new funds allocated to education have been available for the improvement of regular education." Kentucky, the state that has spent the most on education

reform, may be witnessing a slowing of change now that the system has "digested" the additional resources.

Many of the recommendations proffered for successfully implementing policies have focused on the balance of rewards, sanctions and adequate technical support for teachers. While such levers may be necessary, they may not be sufficient without some notion of how school buildings will react. Formulaic implementation models may prove inadequate, particularly when they are unidirectional—from the state to the school. A bi-directional model that seeks to diagnose schools as organizational entities, then match support, sanctions, and rewards appropriately is clearly much more complex. Such an approach may prove much more effective, as well.

What role for state departments of education?

The role suggested for departments of education in effecting implementation of legislative mandates, as translators of intent into action, may be to develop school-by-school strategies for implementing reform, rather than broad bureaucratic dictates and one-size-fits-all programs. We do not mean to suggest that departments of education should be the prime mover for change at school sites, but rather that the state's strategy to implement complex, systemic reform, not the reforms themselves, might have to be adapted much more to the realities of each school site. The state has a legitimate and crucial role in defining the goals of the reform and the indicators of successful implementation that schools must use to ascertain progress toward compliance.

The state must also consider what resources are necessary for schools to achieve the state's goals, whether this be in the form of reallocated or new resources. In this context, the department of education may then be expected to exercise a much more strategic role in helping reform to take hold in schools and classrooms. This strategic role entails building networks and partnerships that include educator professional organizations and new, ad hoc groups; sponsoring carefully-selected schools to do initial development work; fostering and supporting a geographically-dispersed network of demonstration sites; convening meetings where schools can learn from one another; encouraging an independent consulting cadre to emerge, including a range of entrepreneurs in addition to school personnel; developing a regional presence, rather than concentrating all of the department's resources in the state capital; recognizing

leading schools and publicly identifying those that are doing what the state wants, particularly those that do so on an accelerated timeline and without being a "pilot" school; similarly recognizing educators who provide leadership to the reforms; developing all the elements of institutionalization, such as standardized vocabulary, reporting forms, intersegmental connections, etc., in a timely fashion.

At the same time, departments of education must not "go native." They must remain credible intermediaries between legislatures and the schools, but recall that their first duty is to implement laws as directed by legislatures. Departments of education are depended upon to clarify and operationalize a law while keeping in mind the realities of schools. They must be seen by school people as being capable and committed to fulfilling these responsibilities in an expeditious manner. If they do not, schools will "fill in the blanks" themselves and operationalize the reform program in ways that are consistent with the school's existing culture and practices. Or educators will simply become disillusioned, skeptical, and increasingly cynical.

Multiple motivations and influences

Educator compliance is also likely influenced by a range of organizations from which they gain information. Although these organizations may have no formal charter to speak on educational policy related to reform, they often have opinions and issue publications or convene meetings in which they express their opinions. These organizations include state organizations for administrators and school boards, teachers' unions, content area professional groups, newspapers, and higher education. Educators, then, scan the environment to determine the tradeoffs involved in complying with a policy framework that implies great change. They withhold compliance until they receive relatively unambiguous signals from a wide range of sources, not just legislatures and departments of education, although the department of education is clearly the most important voice.

Two surveys tend to confirm these general observations. The Oregon School Boards Association's February 13, 1997 survey of 500 registered voters and a March, 1997 interview of key Oregon educators by Conkling, Fiskum, and McCormick for the Oregon Department of Education indicate the mixed signals educators are receiving from various constituencies. The interviews also suggest

even school administrators, superintendents and principals are still waiting to be engaged as partners in developing the specifics of reform implementation.

Where we are going next

Our proposed line of investigation will seek to explain, then predict, the ways in which external mandates are processed. Our goal is to enable states to identify a priori the conditions that will facilitate implementation at each school site. This may allow educational reform programs to contain the right combination of methods and mechanisms to support the desired goals of the reform.

Simultaneously, it may be advantageous for the state to understand when it has developed policies that are unacceptable to schools, that fall outside the bounds of socially compliant behavior for teachers. Not all policy is good policy. Not all policy is acceptable policy. If the state is able to anticipate how a policy is likely to be processed by schools, it becomes more capable of modifying policies that are unworkable or patently bad ideas. Ultimately, the policy-making process itself might become more rational and coherent. Schools as institutions crave rationality and coherence in policy.

Of course, this approach implies that the goal of policy making is to send logical and consistent messages to those in implementation roles over time, and that this is a good goal. Other models of policy development are less concerned with such values. However, these seem like reasonable targets toward which to shape the policy process, since a system that acts like it is rational and consistent will over time come to reinforce such behavior in socially-compliant individuals within the system. In the end a reinforcing loop may be created that leads both to greater policy coherence in education and to more ready acceptance by educators of policy initiatives that are well-conceived and consistent.

References

Aronson, Eliot 1988. The social animal, 5th. ed. New York: W. H. Freeman & Co.

Barnard, Chester 1968 [1938]. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Berman, P. & M. McLaughlin (1978). Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Volume 8: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Black, Paul (1994, Summer). Performance Assessment and Accountability: The Experience in England and Wales. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 16(2), 191-203.

Broom, Leonard and Selznick, Philip 1955, Sociology: A text with adapted readings. NY: Peterson, Row.

Brown, Roger 1986. Social psychology, 2nd edition. New York: Free Press.

Case, Roland (1994, Winter). Our Crude Handling of Educational Reforms: The Case of Curricular Integration. Canadian Journal of Education. 19(1), 80-93.

Commission on the Skills of the American Work Force (1990). America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages! Rochester, NY: National Center on Education and the Economy.

Conkling, Fiskum & McCormick (1997, March 7). Report on Executive Interviews. Oregon Department of Education, Salem, Oregon.

Conley, David & Goldman, Paul 1995. Reactions from the field to state restructuring legislation. Educational Administration Quarterly 31, 5, 512-38.

DiMaggio, Paul & Powell, Walter W. 1991, Introduction in W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (eds.), The new institutionalism in organizational analysis. Chicago: U. of Chicago.

Education Week (1997, March 5). Special Education. Education Week. 16(23), 13.

Fullan, Michael and Matthew Miles. "Getting Reform Right: What Works and What Doesn't." Phi Delta Kappan 73 (1992): 745-752.

Fullan, Michael with Susan Stiegelbauer (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Goldman, Paul & Conley, David 1994. School responses to state-level restructuring legislation. OSSC Reports 35, 1, 1-12 + 1-24 of supplement.

Goldman, P. & Conley, D. 1996. Oregon Educator Reactions to Restructuring Legislation: Survey Results 1992-1995. Department of Educational Leadership, Technology, and Administration. University of Oregon.

Leavitt, Harold 1996. The old days, hot groups, and managers' lib. Administrative Science Quarterly, 41, 2, 288-300

Lee, V. and J. B. Smith. Effects of School Restructuring on the Achievement and Engagement of Middle-Grade Students. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, 1992.

Lipsky, Michael (1980). Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services. New York: Sage.

Louis, Karen Seashore, & Miles, Matthew (1990). Improving the Urban High School: What Works and Why. New York: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, Milbrey (1990, December). The RAND Change Agent Study Revisited: Macro Perspectives and Micro Realities. Educational Researcher. 19(9).

Meyer, John and Rowan, Brian 1977. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83, 2, 340-63.

Minnesota Department of Education. Proposed Rule for Secondary Graduation. Minnesota Department of Education, 1991.

Muncey, Donna and Patrick McQuillan. "Preliminary Findings from a Five-Year Study of the Coalition of Essential Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 74 (6 1993): 486-489.

Murphy, Joseph 1992. The landscape of leadership preparation : Reframing the education of school administrators. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Murphy, Joseph and Philip Hallinger, eds. Restructuring Schooling: Learning from Ongoing Efforts. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, 1993.

The Nelson Report (1997, February 13). Oregon School Boards Association Survey Research Report: Executive Summary. Oregon School Boards Association, Salem, Oregon

Odden, Allan and Priscilla Wohlstetter. "The Role of Agenda Setting in the Politics of School Finance: 1970-1990." Educational Policy 6 (4 1992): 355-376.

Pinder, Craig 1991. Valence-instrumentality-expectancy theory. In Motivation and work behavior, 5th ed. Edited by R. Steers and L. Porter. New York: McGraw Hill, pp. 144-63.

Province of British Columbia, Ministry of Education. Status of Ministry Programs and Initiatives to Support Education Reform in British Columbia. Victoria: Province of British Columbia, 1992.

Rosenholtz, Susan 1989. Teachers' workplace. New York: Longman.

Rothman, Robert (1992, September 23). Pennsylvania Board Delays Vote on 'Learning Outcomes' Plan. Education Week. 12(3), 19.

Selznick, Philip 1996, Instituitionalism: "Old" and "new." Administrative Science Quarterly 41, 2, 270-277.

Steffy, Betty (1993). The Kentucky Education Reform Act: Lessons for America. Lancaster, PA: Technomics.

Stockard, Jean and Maralee Mayberry. Effective Educational Environments. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, 1992.

Sullivan, Barry. A Legacy for Learners. The Report of the Royal Commission on Education. Vancouver: Province of British Columbia, 1988.

Teddlie, Charles and Samuel Stringfield. Schools Make a Difference. New York: Teachers College Press, 1993.

Weick, Karl 1976. Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems. Administrative Science Quarterly. 21(2), 1-19.

Yukl, Gary 1991. Leadership in organizations, 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

31

Appendix A. Scale Items

Attitude towards change ("Change"):

H.B. 3565 will be implemented because time for fundamental change
H.B. 3565 will be implemented because schools are already doing 3565
H.B. 3565 ideas make sense
H.B. 3565 will be implemented because system isn't working for many kids
H.B. 3565 is unrealistic (reverse coded)
H.B. 3565 is not good educational ideas (reverse coded)
H.B. 3565 is unfair to some students (reverse coded)
H.B. 3565 is too much change too fast (reverse coded)
I am skeptical (reverse coded)
I have opportunity to do things I've wanted
I will take seriously when funded (reverse coded)
I don't see implications for me (reverse coded)
I have too much else to do (reverse coded)

Anticipated Changes in Practices ("Practices"):

Effect-promote developmentally appropriate practice
Effect-increase teacher control
Effect-increase no of instructional strategies
Effect-greater integration of social services
Effect-greater curriculum integration
Effect-diverse ways to group students
Effect-more teacher decision-making
Effect-increased teacher collegiality

Expected Outcomes ("Outcomes")

Effect-benefit all students
Effect-benefit college-bound
Effect-kids enter kindergarten better prepared
Effect-CIM will decrease dropouts
Effect-ALCs will decrease dropouts
Site councils will lead to learning
Increased accountability will lead to learning
Funding for preschool will lead to learning
Extended school year will lead to learning
CIM will lead to learning
CAM will lead to learning
Alternative learning centers will lead to learning
Mixed age classrooms will lead to learning
Philosophy of individual development will lead to learning

Appendix B. Oregon Individual Educator Reactions to School Reform Legislation, 1992 to 1995 (scale means, selected demographic categories)

	attitude				changes				outcomes			
	1992	1993	1994	1995	1992	1993	1994	1995	1992	1993	1994	1995
Mean	54	54	54	51	61	65	66	57	63	60	56	53
Position												
teacher	52	52	52	49	58	62	63	55	62	57	54	51
other certified	56	59	57	56	64	71	73	65	66	62	62	60
administrator	67	72	75	63	77	84	84	72	73	77	70	67
School type												
high school	57	54	54	50	65	61	65	55	64	57	53	51
middle school	53	55	53	51	54	66	66	58	63	59	57	53
elementary	51	52	54	51	61	67	66	59	62	57	59	58
Age												
20-29	50	56	51	49	60	67	67	61	62	64	57	57
30-39	53	57	56	49	62	68	65	56	63	61	58	53
40-49	55	53	52	51	62	65	65	56	64	59	54	52
50-59	54	54	55	52	59	61	68	58	63	57	58	53
60+	53	62	57	48	49	84	68	56	53	79	67	57
Gender												
female	54	56	57	54	62	67	69	61	65	61	61	57
male	54	53	50	47	59	62	62	51	61	57	50	48

Appendix C. Oregon district reactions to school reform legislation, 1992 to 1995 (scale means, all districts)

		attitude				changes				outcomes			
District	ADM	1992	1993	1994	1995	1992	1993	1994	1995	1992	1993	1994	1995
	Mean	54	54	54	50	61	65	56	57	63	59	54	53
1	15,000+	49	49	58	51	53	50	63	55	59	55	58	60
2	15,000+	57	56	67	56	69	61	64	70	70	57	67	56
3	15,000+	49	42	48	44	49	54	53	45	60	50	48	47
4	10,000+	54	57	50	50	59	64	53	58	65	63	50	53
5	10,000+			60	52			65	65			60	58
6	5,000+	54	57	56	50	61	65	53	56	62	59	56	47
7	5,000+	59	64	55	56	69	77	56	63	66	72	55	58
8	5,000+			48	44			53	50			48	49
9	2,500+	61	55	51	45	73	68	51	50	69	57	51	47
10	2,500+	54	50	52	53	62	66	50	61	59	58	52	52
11	2,500+	48	48	56	47	58	64	53	56	57	58	56	50
12	2,500+	58	57	46	47	68	70	44	51	65	62	46	49
13	500+	58		58	39	52		64	49	61		58	45
14	1,000+	54		53	50	56		56	40	61		53	45
15	2,500+			61	59			71	67			61	63
16	2,500+			54	51			61	59			54	57
17	1,000+	52	63	73	56	60	79	81	58	66	69	73	64
18	5,000+			51	55			57	63			51	57
19	500+			51	40			44	40			51	39
20	500+			60	56			63	62			60	64

Appendix D. Oregon school building reactions to school reform legislation, 1992 to 1995 (scale means, selected districts & schools)

		attitude				changes				outcomes			
District		1992	1993	1994	1995	1992	1993	1994	1995	1992	1993	1994	1995
1	HS	62		62		71		76		56		63	
1	MS	47		57		45		100		61		75	
1	MS	46	46		60	42	47		75	58	46		78
1	El	42	52	56	44	35	58	56	42	52	50	54	51
1	El	51	49	39	29	62	46	54	32	70	60	59	46
1	El	43		69	49	59		72	62	57		72	62
2	HS	57	54	64	59	65	56	68	73	69	56	63	56
2	MS	60	60	74	47	75	71	82	53	75	60	66	49
3	HS	53	42	49	42	56	53	59	43	61	49	54	48
3	MS	52		47	48	47		57	38	64		66	53
3	El	44	42	47		46	57	53		54	55	54	
3	El	39		47	41	43		56	37	47		40	44
4	HS	56	59	51	56	52	60	60	60	63	63	53	54
4	JH	53			46	53			62	64			54
4	JH	60		48	44	64		70	59	68		50	49
4	El	54		61		71		68		64		66	
4	El	50	48	49	51	63	80	51	67	68	61	56	62
5	HS	58		61	58	66		75	67	67		56	62
5	MS	50	51	43	43	45	61	59	49	49	54	45	37
5	El	50		52	65	66		66	76	63		53	65
5	El	66	50	44		69	75	68		65	62	41	
6	MS	51	48	53	45	59	61	65	56	58	53	52	44
6	El	52				70				52			
6	El	60	48	63	55	81	75	75	59	81	70	57	72
7	HS	53		48	44	60		54	55	61		49	47
7	MS	64		57		73		64		81		54	
7	El	52	55	49	55	59	65	55	64	58	66	52	60
7	El	72	80	87	88	87	94	93	99	74	85	91	91
7	El	59		49		81		82		62		51	
8	HS	62	60	60	54	71	65	71	56	65	60	53	45
8	MS	55	52	53	47	67	70	65	53	63	62	53	46
8	El	51		62	51	53		72	70	59		68	54
8	El	45	50	41	45	44	62	41	48	46	57	42	45

Appendix E: Proposed instrument for further research

Policy prod/structure	Effect* on your practices little lot	Effect* on your school little lot	Your perception of the policy Good idea bad idea
1. Benchmarks for student performance in grades 3, 5, 8, 10, 12			
2. Site councils			
3. Grants to schools (e.g., Goals 2000)			
4. CIM (state tests)			
5. CIM (student work samples)			
6. CAM (state tests)			
7. CAM (endorsements)			
8. CAM (school-to-work experiences)			
9. Demand from business community to improve education			
10. Pressure from parents to initiate reform			
11. Higher education proficiency-based admission requirements (PASS)			
12. Accountability requirements (e.g., Oregon Report Card)			
13. Communication from ODE			
14. Work of pilot sites elsewhere in dist. or state			
15. Prospect of recognition by state as a leading school			
16. Concern about meeting new ODE standardization requirements			
17. Teachers in your school actively supporting school reform			
18. Meetings you've attended where you've learned about reform requirements and teaching methods to achieve reform goals			
19. Grants from the state to do school improvement projects (e.g., 2020 grant, Goals 2000 grant)			
20. Principal's support of reform			
21. District's support of reform			

* "Effect" means implementing school reform mandates

Persistence, Disillusionment, and Compliance in Educator Reactions to State School Reform

	Your engagement in the activities/attitudes listed: little lot	Prevalence in your school little lot	Degree to which activities/attitudes are responses to reform policies little lot
Activity/attitude:			
1. Engaging in collaborative planning			
2. Integrating curriculum			
3. Developing new curriculum			
4. Modifying curriculum			
5. Holding special needs students to high standards			
6. Developing new strategies for low-achieving students			
7. Using technology to help students meet standards			
8. Reading articles, discussing new programs with peers			
9. Reading, discussing materials from State Dep't of Ed.			
10. Participating in inservice training related to reform			
11. Learning about programs in other schools			
12. Developing grant proposals/school improvement plans			
13. Incorporating career awareness activities into classes, or developing school-to-work programs			
14. Working against reform being implemented			
15. Waiting for more specific direction from ODE			
16. Waiting for more specific direction from district			
17. Waiting for more specific direction from principal			
18. Waiting for more evidence of commitment from legislature			

19. Waiting for more specific commitment from business community			

Factors supporting/inhibiting implementation of school reform components in your school	Support Inhibit
1. History of school	
2. Culture of school	
3. Principal	
4. School district leadership	
5. Other teachers in the building	
6. Available resources	
7. Flexibility of organization	
8. Demographics of teaching staff	
9. Previous school improvement efforts	
10. Inherent ability of the kids in the school	
11. Effort/motivation of the kids in the school	
12. Parents/community	
13. College admission requirements	
14. Physical plant	
15. Amount of time available for prof. dev.	
16. Amount of time available for teaching/learning	
17. A particular "critical incident" Explain:	

If you are changing your practice to accommodate school reform policies, where are you getting the skills to do so?

Activity	most medium least frequent way
District inservice	
Early release days scheduled by school	
State inservice days	
Summer contract	
Summer work without pay or credit	
College or university course	
Observing a colleague	
Discussing with a colleague	
Reading materials from ODE	
Receiving information at faculty meetings	
State conferences sponsored by a subject area organization	
Statewide or regional meetings sponsored by ODE or other state-level agency	
Consultants who work with school	
On my own	
Other:	

Personal information/views

	5-point high/low
I understand the goals of school reform	
I support the goals of school reform	
I have changed my practices in the classroom in response to school reform	
I will change my practices in the classroom in response to school reform	
The activities needed for school reform to improve student learning are beyond my control	

Demographic info (same as last survey)

Appendix F: Comments reflecting reservations about complying with law/accepting legitimacy of mandates

- I am amazed that anyone would think of designing a school system patterned after a German system.
- It's a political decision, quality education has nothing to do with it.
- State mandate with vague/little support.
- Legislature demanded it.
- Schools will do it because its law.
- Based on erroneous assumption that current system is at fault for most students' failure.
- A need to prepare the public is present. Non educators create a situation that teachers will have to take "flack" from the public for.
- This seems to be a renaming effort rather than a reform effort.
- There will be a lot more useless paper work to disguise the fact that schools are warehouses, not institutions for fundamental improvement.
- If schools are to change, then teachers need to be empowered to create the change. We are usually the last to be asked -- and we're usually Not asked at all, but TOLD. Until this practice changes, the nothing will change.
- I disagree with the idea of the CIM and the CAM. We should be graduating students with a broad education. What I fear is that we will turn out little workers who have no knowledge of how to fit into society. I'm sure the business community will love this plan, because it is geared to the interests of business and industry. The individual and society will lose. Where are all these technical schools for the CIM graduates? Is business going to provide them? I doubt it. This is basically the system that Great Britain uses, and there the non-college Bound sixteen year olds go straight onto the dole. I also disagree that out system is at fault when students fail. Many students come to school so overwhelmed by personal problems or so lazy and disinterested that they cannot succeed.
- I feel that this law was passed without enough forethought by people that know how students learn. One gets the idea that someone wanted something changed, but was really unsure of what needed to be changed or how it would be changed. Sometimes a bad idea, or old idea, is better than no idea at all. Change, for the sake of change is not justified, change for the better is justified. Find something better than change.
- Teachers for administrators are starting to worry about their "turf" and how to continue as before rather than how to adjust to the new requirements.
- The Ivory Tower in Salem needs to justify their jobs and create more work for already overworked administration and teachers.
- How long before we have something else new? If we want to do good things lets get a good source of revenue and then proceed ahead knowing we can stay with the good things we change.
- Change for change sake is not the answer. Stay with the good things we're doing. Get a grip Salem!
- Well I change every year anyway - try to stay current & flexible so I don't think I will have to change a great deal

- HB 3565 presents some wonderful opportunities for education; it is defeating, however, to undertake this in the face of budget cuts and the demoralization occurring in schools because of increased demands on educators' time.
- There has been a noticeable disregard and disrespect for teachers and teacher trainers in the planning of this Bill and attempts to implement it!
- As long as this state continues to under fund public education, I do not see how any worthwhile change can be expected to happen. It is ridiculous to expect all these changes without the funds to support it.
- Feel like I'm teaching in a blender & it's just been turned up to highest (puree) speed!
- I was looking forward to quietly retiring in the next couple of years - HA!
- It would have made sense for the state to ask teachers what would work before they started to reform. I don't call implementing a reform "in a way that fits your site," empowerment. The "make it happen" attitude of the state is a real turn off--especially without resources, personnel and social back up programs.
- Need to make it less elitist. More supported by teachers. Less confrontational. We need to be informed in a respectful manner. In our district the (L) hand doesn't know what the (R) hand is doing. It's like a secret that you get bits & pieces but no-one ever gives you a knowledgeable account of it
- I think someone used it to make a name for herself to get elected
- The Legislature was concerned about the appearance of change and not the reality. They have created a system composed of the very worst "snake oil" Remedies many of which have already been rejected in other states. Their sincerity in desiring real change is measured by the amount of new money they have made available to implement it.
- Why are we doing this!?
- If the state of Oregon is going to mandate this program, they must be forced to pay for the changes that we will see. That includes adequate training for all teachers, adequate materials, and educational programming that will allow parents to understand what it involves. Local school districts must not be forced to carry the burden for funding programs devised by a group of people who are too far removed from the classroom to understand what we do each day. It is time to ask real classroom teachers how they do their job; maybe then we can see some significant change. We cannot, however, continued to make these changes for free.
- My concerns lie at the secondary level, especially. For one, mandating change & ideas doesn't translate to change actually happening. My fear is that some practices will be carried over into new structure thus no change has really occurred.
- This is not even close to being a realistic approach to education without complete funding. The legislature and the people of Oregon need to get with the program and support education or it is going to become disastrous.
- Change is needed and wanted, but we as teachers do not feel that we are given enough information fro the state level as to what is actually possible funding wise--.
- I have not been presented with any facts that demonstrate to me why this should be put into effect. I feel that the biggest problems with education is that school is not a privilege, but a right and that the values of society are much different in the states then most countries. I do not see how this bill meets these needs.

- My overall feeling, I think is reflected by many teachers' thoughts. The Bill was hastily thought up, is hastily being implemented, with inadequate funding. How do we take seriously the predicted effects of Measure 5 and at the same time come up with any new programs well developed? Communication at all levels is poor. No one is addressing the aspects of this bill which seem to be very "European" in its focus--and at odds philosophically with what so many of us are trying to do!!
- There is much resistance among teachers fearing change.
- Give us the bucks! Pay me (or trade me) for my extra time. I am a professional.
- I am concerned that teachers are being asked to make changes without having all the information to make those changes successful.
- Schools have not had enough time , direction from the state to put the new programs into place.
- The author of the bill, Vera Katz, annoyed me because she doesn't really strike me as a master of pedagogical theory, but rather as someone with power and a lot of opinions.
- When do we get treated or paid in a way that reflects the time, money and education spent to become teachers? Teachers are being driven from the field by these issues, and constant changing that isn't backed long-term by the district.
- I will be forced to teach in a manner which I do not necessarily agree or am comfortable with. I may be forced to leave education when or if it is mandated that ideas morally repugnant to my values are mandated to be taught in the schools.
- As with many projects, it would have been a good idea if they had really talked to the people most involved before they chose to implement a program. Perhaps major concerns could have been addressed then.
- This kind of thing wastes my time that I need to be ready to help kids learn. Give me time, support, and pats on the back for my efforts now. Come join us for a month & see & feel what it is really like.
- You know, I have found that teachers are usually looking for ideas that work well and will happily jump on any such ideas. However, to force ideas that don't work or possibly will do harm to students really causes stress to good teachers. Please don't think I'm against everything in the law. There are some good points that are addressed - such as site councils.
- I think HB 3565 is bad for education. Our focus is not on academics. We are becoming not institutions for learning but a social service agency. I would like legislative supporters to teach in a classroom to see the shortcomings and pitfalls of this bill.
- Creators of this house bill - Were they in the classroom full time? What grade(s) did they teach? Money available? Proven methods?

EA027287

ERIC

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: "PERSISTENCE, DISILLUSIONMENT, AND COMPLIANCE IN EDUCATOR REACTIONS TO STATE SCHOOL REFORM"	
Author(s): DAVID T. CONLEY & PAUL GOLDMAN	
Corporate Source: N/A	Publication Date: 3/25/97

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents	
☒ Check here **For Level 1 Release:** Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	☐ Check here **For Level 2 Release:** Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.
	Level 1	**Level 2**	

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please	Signature: David T. Conley	Printed Name/Position/Title: DAVID T. CONLEY DIRECTOR, PASS PROJECT & ASSOC. PROFESSOR, UNIV. OF OREGON	
	Organization/Address: PASS PROJECT - OSSHE P.O. BOX 3175 EUGENE OR 97403-0175	Telephone: 541-346-5799	FAX: 541-346-5828
		E-Mail Address: david_conley@ccmail.uoregon.edu	Date: 4/2/97

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

N/A

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

N/A

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
College of Education
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-5207

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com